

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 18 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-3 and 6-18 were rejected.

Claim 4 and 5 were objected to.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 12 were amended.

### **I. 35 USC 112 Rejections**

The Examiner has objected to the wording of Claims 4-9 under 35 USC 112. In view of the Examiner's comments, Claims 4, 6 and 8 have been amended. All claims are now believed to stand in proper form.

### **II. 35 USC 102(e) Rejections**

**Claim 1, 2, 6 and 9-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,382,833 to Hurd.**

The rejected claims include three independent claims, which are Claim 1, Claim 12 and Claim 19. These claims have been amended and are believed to be clearly distinguishable over the cited prior art references, as is explained below.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 sets forth a slide pad device for a ladder having at least two ladder rails that rest upon the ground. The purpose of the slide pads is to decrease the coefficient of friction between the ground and the ladder so that the ladder can be more readily slide along the ground. Thus, the present invention makes the ladder easier to move.

The slide pad has a hard, smooth bottom surface that has a coefficient of friction against the ground that is less than that of the ladder rails that touch the ground. A receptacle structure

extending upwardly from slide pad so that the slide pad can be attached to a ladder rail so that it is interposed between the ladder rail and the ground when the ladder is erected on the ground.

**The Hurd patent** is entitled “Non-Slipping Foot For Ladder Legs”. The Hurd patent discloses a foot for a ladder rail with a rubber pad (16). The rubber pad (16) is grooved (17) to increase its resistance to slipping. The purpose of the Hurd patent is to prevent a ladder rail from moving by greatly increasing the coefficient of friction between the ladder and the ground. This is the exact opposite of what the present invention hopes to accomplish.

Referring specifically to the wording of Claim 1, the Hurd patent clearly does not disclose a ladder slide pad with a hard, smooth bottom surface that has a coefficient of friction that is less than that of the ladder rail. Accordingly, the Hurd patent does not anticipate the matter of Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

It is therefore believed that the matter of Claim 1 is distinguishable over the Hurd patent. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection as applied to Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

#### Claim 12

Claim 12 sets forth a method of improving the mobility of a ladder by attaching slide pads to the bottom end of a ladder rails so that the slide pads are interposed between the ladder rails and the ground. Each of the slide pads has a hard bottom surface that embodies a coefficient of friction, when in contact with the ground, that is less than that of the ladder rails.

As has been previously mentioned, the Hurd patent discloses non-skid pads that make a

ladder harder to slide, not easier. Thus, the Hurd patent does not disclose the method step of providing and attaching slide pads that make a ladder easier to slide.

It is therefore believed that the matter of Claim 12 is distinguishable over the Hurd patent. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection as applied to Claim 12 and its dependent claims.

### **Claim 19**

Claim 19 sets forth a step ladder assembly. The step ladder assembly has slide pads coupled to the bottom ends of the ladder rails. The slide pads have a hard surface that contacts the ground and presents a lower coefficient of friction against the ground than do the support rails.

The Hurd patent discloses non-skid pads that make a ladder harder to slide, not easier. Thus, the Hurd patent does not disclose any ladder assembly with slide pads that make the ladder easier to slide.

It is therefore believed that the matter of Claim 19 is distinguishable over the Hurd patent. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection as applied to Claim 19 and its dependent claims.

### **Claim 1, 2, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,904,128 to Boham.**

The rejected claims include one independent claim, which is Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended and is believed to be clearly distinguishable over the cited prior art references, as is

explained below.

As is again stated, Claim 1 sets forth a slide pad device for a ladder having at least two ladder rails that rest upon the ground. The purpose of the slide pads is to decrease the coefficient of friction between the ground and the ladder so that the ladder can be more readily slide along the ground. Thus, the present invention makes the ladder easier to move along the ground.

The slide pad has a hard, smooth bottom surface that has a coefficient of friction against the ground that is less than that of the ladder rails that touch the ground. A receptacle structure extending upwardly from slide pad base so that the slide base can be attached to a ladder rail and interposed between the ladder rail and the ground when the ladder is erected on the ground.

**The Boham patent** discloses a ladder hood. The ladder hood attaches to the **TOP** of the ladder rails and pads the top of the ladder rails so that the ladder rails do not damage the wall upon which they are leaning.

As applied to the wording of Claim 1, the Boham patent does not disclose slide pads having a hard, smooth bottom surface that contacts the ground. Furthermore, the Boham patent does not disclose any pad that attaches to ladder rails so that the pad is interposed between the ladder rails and the ground. Lastly, the Boham patent makes no disclosure of any device that would decrease the coefficient of friction between the bottom of a ladder rail and the ground.

In the Boham patent, a plush pad is disclosed that is attached to the tops of ladder rails. Even if such plush pads were attached to the bottom of ladder rails, they would not necessarily decrease friction. For instance, if a ladder were resting on a rough surface, such as concrete, or earth, a plush pad would increase friction against such a surface, not decrease it.

It is therefore believed that the matter of Claim 1 is distinguishable over the Boham patent. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection as applied to Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

**Claim 1, 2, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,062,319 to Wright.**

The rejected claims include one independent claims, which is Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended and is believed to be clearly distinguishable over the cited prior art references, as is explained below.

As is yet again stated, Claim 1 sets forth a slide pad device for a ladder having at least two ladder rails that rest upon the ground. The purpose of the slide pads is to decrease the coefficient of friction between the ground and the ladder so that the ladder can be more readily slide along the ground. Thus, the present invention makes the ladder easier to move along the ground.

The slide pad has a hard, smooth bottom surface that has a coefficient of friction against the ground that is less than that of the ladder rails that touch the ground. A receptacle structure extending upwardly from slide pad base so that the slide base can be attached to a ladder rail so that the slide pad is interposed between the ladder rail and the ground when the ladder is erected on the ground.

**The Wright patent** is entitled “Anti-Slip, Anti-Mar Ladder Head”. The Wright patent discloses a cover for the top of ladder rails that prevents the top of the ladder rails from slipping

along a wall.

The Wright patent makes no disclosure of any type of pad that decreases friction and makes a ladder easier to move.

The Wright patent makes no disclosure of any slide pad that attaches to the bottom of a ladder's rails.

The Wright patent makes no disclosure of any slide pad with a hard, smooth bottom surface that contacts the ground.

It is therefore believed that the matter of Claim 1 is distinguishable over the Wright patent. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection as applied to Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

**Claims 12, 16, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,417,302 to McElfresh**

The rejected claims include one independent claims, which is Claim 12. Claim 12 has been amended and is believed to be clearly distinguishable over the cited prior art references, as is explained below.

Claim 12 sets forth a method of improving the mobility of a ladder by attaching slide pads to the bottom end of a ladder rails so that the slide pads are interposed between the ladder rails and the ground. Each of the slide pads has a hard bottom surface that embodies a coefficient of friction, when in contact with the ground, that is less than that of the ladder rails. In this manner, the ladder is easier to slide along the ground with the slide pads than it would be without the slide pads.

**The McElfresh patent** discloses a stabilizer structure for a stepladder that extends across the bottom of the rails of the stepladder. However, as is clearly stated in the McElfresh patent in Column 6, lines 17-23, the stabilizer has recessed areas (32) on its bottom surface. The purpose of the recessed areas (32) are to “improve frictional engagement of the stabilizer 10 with the supporting surface to reduce the possibility of lateral slippage when the stabilizer is used on a hard supporting surface”.

It is therefore clear that the stabilizer of the McElfresh patent is intended to decrease the ability of the ladder to slide, rather than increase that ability. Thus, the McElfresh patent does not disclose the method step of providing and attaching slide pads that make a ladder easier to slide.

It is therefore believed that the matter of Claim 1 is distinguishable over the McElfresh patent. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection as applied to Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

### **III. DRAWINGS**

The Official Draftsman's objections to the drawings have been noted. Formal drawings will be filed upon receipt of the Notice of Allowance for this application.

### **IV. SUMMARY**

Having fully distinguished the pending claims over the cited art, this application is believed to stand in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is requested to call the applicant's attorney at (215) 321-6772 in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved without the necessity of issuing a further Office Action.

Respectfully Submitted,



Eric A. LaMorte  
Reg. No. 34,653  
Attorney For Applicant

LaMorte & Associates  
P.O. BOX 434  
Yardley, PA 19067  
(215) 321-6772